

HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.

June 11, 2013
HPGI File: 11263

City of Vaughan
Clerks Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive
Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

C 16
COMMUNICATION
CW (Public Hearing)
June 11/13
ITEM - 4

Attn: Jeffrey Abrams, City Clerk

RE: June 11, 2013 Public Meeting of the Committee of the Whole
Response to Draft Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan
By: H & L Title Inc., Ledbury Investments Ltd., Anland Developments Inc. &
2811187 Ontario Limited

Further to Mr. Davies' letter dated June 10, 2013; a copy of which is attached hereto, this shall confirm that Humphries Planning Group Inc., represents Anland Developments Inc. On behalf of Anland Developments Inc., we confirm support of the position put forth by Mr. Davies on behalf of the Group as described therein and further advise that Anland Developments Inc., adopts and puts forth on its own the position as set out in Mr. Davies correspondence.

Anland Developments Inc. objects to the Draft Secondary Plan in its entirety and submits that further work and consultation is required and would be most pleased to meet with the City of Vaughan and its representatives to further this study process in order to arrive at a positive solution.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,
HUMPHRIES PLANNING GROUP INC.



Rosemarie L. Humphries BA, MCIP, RPP
President


cc. Anland Developments Inc.

216 Chrislea Road
Suite 103
Vaughan, ON
L4L 8S5

T: 905-264-7678
F: 905-264-8073

www.humphriesplanning.com
~ Do Something Good Everyday! ~





Davies
Howe
Partners
LLP

Lawyers

The Fifth Floor
99 Spadina Ave
Toronto, Ontario
M5V 3P8

T 416.977.7088
F 416.977.8931
davieshowe.com

Please refer to: **Jeffrey L. Davies**
e-mail: jdavies@davieshowe.com
direct line: 416.263.4508
File No. 702586

June 10, 2013

By Courier

Committee of the Whole
City of Vaughan
Clerks Department
2141 Major Mackenzie Drive
Vaughan, ON L6A 1T1

Attention: Rosanna DeFrancesca, Chair of the Committee of the Whole
Jeffrey Abrams, City Clerk
John MacKenzie, Commissioner of Planning

Dear Sirs/Mesdames:

Re: June 11, 2013 Public Meeting of the Committee of the Whole
Response to Draft Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan
By: H & L Title Inc., Ledbury Investments Ltd., Anland
Developments Inc. & 281187 Ontario Limited

Davies Howe Partners LLP and Weston Consulting Group Inc. represent H&L Title Inc. and Ledbury Investments Ltd. Parente Borean LLP and Humphries Planning Group Inc. represent 281187 Ontario Limited, and Humphries Planning Group Inc. represents Anland Developments Inc. This letter is submitted on behalf of the four companies (collectively referred to herein as "the Group").

The Group's lands are located within "Area 3" of the Draft Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan (Draft Secondary Plan). These lands amount to approximately 97 acres or roughly 73% of the remaining undeveloped lands within Area 3 and are located south of Rutherford Road to the north, Highway 400 to the east, Weston Road to the west and the future extension of Bass Pro Mills Drive to the south. A map is attached for your convenience.

By way of background information, the Group members have actively participated in both the City of Vaughan Official Plan and the Vaughan Mills Centre Secondary Plan Study review processes. The Group members have obtained party status in the Ontario Municipal Board proceedings for the Vaughan Official Plan.



Davies
Howe
Partners
LLP

We take this opportunity to provide the following submissions regarding the Draft Secondary Plan:

First, the Group submits that the Draft Secondary Plan contains several shortcomings and requires further review. Accordingly, the Group objects to the Draft Secondary Plan.

Second, the Plan fails to address many fundamental land use planning issues and was created prior to the finalization of necessary background and technical studies. The Draft Secondary Plan has also failed to appropriately incorporate the Group's submissions throughout the study process. It is submitted that the elements of land uses, density, height and street network all require further consideration.

Third, the Draft Secondary Plan provides nine (9) Guiding Principles within Part B, Section 1.2 and uses these principles as a benchmark for guiding the development and measuring the success of the plan. We have reviewed these principles and submit that the distribution of land uses and associated policy regimes in the Draft Secondary Plan are inappropriate. Therefore, the Draft Secondary Plan should be amended to designate the Group's lands for mixed use purposes. This designation would more appropriately account for the land's context and relationship to Vaughan Mills, the mixed use lands to the north, the residential lands to the west, and the future extension of Bass Pro Drive to the south.


Principle 1 – Create a Vibrant, Complete, Mixed-Use Urban Centre

The Draft Secondary Plan does little to integrate future land uses on both sides of Highway 400 and continues the highway as a major physical boundary. As a result, the Group's lands within Area 3 Employment are inappropriately segregated from the high density, retail and mixed uses on the east side of Highway 400 and south of Rutherford Road. Little effort or initiative has been made to link the Group's lands, and the projected 7590 jobs associated with their lands, to the planned transit hub connected to the mall. The Group submits this land use pattern is not good planning and will hinder the creation of a vibrant and complete mixed-use urban centre.

The proposed road network within Area 3 is comprised of too many planned streets. The Group submits this requires further consideration in order to appropriately contribute to this principle.

Principle 2 – Foster a High Quality of Place, Design Excellence, and Sustainability

While we generally agree with this principle, we observe that its implementation is undermined by the land use issues outlined above, resulting in the loss of the



Davies
Howe
Partners
LLP

opportunity for considerable synergy between both sides of Highway 400 and a “human scaled” environment. A mixed use designation in Area 3 would better reflect Principle 2.

Principle 3 – Provide a Diverse Range of Housing Options in Vaughan Mills Centre

The Draft Secondary Plan does not provide for any type of housing within Area 3, which is inconsistent with the permitted residential uses within Area 1 and Area 2. It is also unclear as to whether building “ground family oriented” housing around a regional mall has been thoroughly considered.


Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that low and medium density/ground housing will replace any of the out-parcel retail buildings in the Vaughan Mills Mall. In order to achieve the desired variety of housing options, we submit that low, medium and high density residential uses should be planned within Area 3, having regard to the residential area to the west.

Principle 4 – Enhance the Role of Vaughan Mills Centre as a “Centre” of Economic Activity, Jobs, and Commerce in the Region

We submit that it is common for regional shopping centres like Vaughan Mills to create sizable land use synergies for the surrounding area, especially as the regional centre matures. Vaughan Mills is not yet complete, so this process will continue for the foreseeable future. The Draft Secondary Plan fails to recognize these positive spin-off effects and how to plan for them for the future. The creation of a unique employment and commercial environment is restrained by the rigid policies in the Plan, such as maximum floor area. Likewise, the Draft Secondary Plan fails to recognize the west side of the Highway 400 corridor in this area as an attractive location for offices, corporate headquarters, hotels, convention centres and forms of residential use. The restrictions placed on Area 3, including 10 storey building heights and 2.0 FSI, are arbitrary and should be revisited. Area 3 requires higher building types, heights and density in order to better utilize existing investments in provincial and city infrastructure, such as Highway 400, its interchanges and the road network.

Principle 5 – A Walkable Urban Environment

Promoting a pedestrian and cyclist-friendly environment is an admirable goal. However, given the shortcomings of the Proposed Secondary Plan, it is unlikely that this goal will materialize.



Davies
Howe
Partners
LLP

Principle 6 – Provide High Quality Open Spaces

The Group submits that the proposed Black Creek Greenway is not considered to be an enhancement of the existing open space corridor, as suggested in the Plan. The proposed location of the Greenway is completely realigned from its existing location and the proposed 70 metre wide Black Creek Greenway is inappropriate. The Group understands that a report prepared by the MMM Group, entitled “Stormwater Management Conceptual Strategy,” has not been made available to the public. This report may prove to be helpful to stakeholders and should be released to allow for their consideration and input. As such, the Group submits that further discussion among the stakeholders is required once the MMM report is released to the public. Following these discussions, it may also be necessary for stakeholders to seek independent advice regarding the MMM report.

Principle 7 – Protect, Restore, and Enhance Natural and Cultural Heritage Resource

The Group submits that further discussions on matters pertaining to natural and cultural resources should be provided for in the Draft Secondary Plan.

Principle 8 – Create Multi-Model Transportation Network

The Group submits that a multi-model transportation network is another area which requires more attention in order to improve the Draft Secondary Plan. Creating a multi-model transportation network throughout the study area is a good objective if density is allocated in a manner that will be supportive. Weston Road is designated as part of the Region’s Transit Priority Network, therefore, land use and intensification should be better implemented within this corridor.

Principle 9 – Sustainable and Resilient

Achieving a full range of housing types in concert with many of the other objectives discussed above can be reached if Area 3 is designated for mixed uses. Area 3 is the most suitable area to provide smaller and compact housing forms, as suggested in the plan (see policy 2.5.2). Many opportunities exist to attain a more appropriate land use designation in Area 3. Further discussions in this regard are required.

Staff and study team members have made it clear that the study process would not consider a reassignment of land use designations from the Official Plan. Nevertheless, lands at the southeast side of Jane Street and Rutherford Avenue that are presently designated for Employment Uses have been added to the planning area for the Draft Secondary Plan. These lands are proposed to be re-designated for High-Rise Mixed-Use. This is one area where the study process was



Davies
Howe
Partners
LLP

varied, presumably for good reason. Likewise, the Group submits that Area 3 should be considered for uses beyond those shown in the Official Plan and these lands should be more appropriately designated for mixed use purposes.

Area 3 holds considerable potential to accommodate a higher and broader range of land uses than reflected by the Draft Secondary Plan and this too should be recognized. In this regard, the table located on page 41 of the Draft Secondary Plan, which provides projections for jobs, units, and population by area, does not provide any unit and population projections for Area 3. We submit that units and population should be added into the projection chart in order to accommodate residential development for Area 3 landholdings and that the table be revised to ensure the mixed use potential of Area 3 is optimized.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Group objects to the Draft Secondary Plan in its entirety and submits that further work and consultation is required to improve the opportunities for, and treatment of, Area 3.

We request the Group's input be considered by Committee members and staff. The Group asks that staff be directed to work with all stakeholders (including the Group) in order to realize the full potential of the planning area. Following this collaboration, the Group asks that staff report back to the Committee with the necessary revisions. The Group is committed to continuing to work with the City and other stakeholders.

Yours sincerely,

DAVIES HOWE PARTNERS LLP

Jeffrey L. Davies
Partner

copy Members of Council
Diana Birchall, Director of Policy Planning
Paul Jankowski, Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works
Members of Landowners Group



LAND OWNERSHIP MAP

LEGEND

— LAND OWNERS GROUP

Air Photograph from Google Earth Pro.
Date of photography: August 2009

WESTON CONSULTING
planning + urban design



File Number: 3867
Date Drawn: 10 JUNE 13
Drawn By: SM
Planner: JL
Scale: NTS
CAD: 3867/schedules/3867 Ownership map.dgn